



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,844	07/02/2001	George Norbert Cox III	8325-0002.01	2083

23419            7590            08/27/2003  
COOLEY GODWARD, LLP  
3000 EL CAMINO REAL  
5 PALO ALTO SQUARE  
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER
----------

BRUSCA, JOHN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/897,844	COX ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John S. Brusca	1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20,22-50,52-78 and 80-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20,22-50,52-78 and 80-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                               | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>9,12,13</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1631

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Information Disclosure Statement received on 22 January 2002 (certificate of mailing dated 14 November 2001) have not been made part of the permanent records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) for this application (37 CFR 1.52(a)) because of damage from the United States Postal Service irradiation process. The above-identified papers, however, were not so damaged as to preclude the USPTO from making a legible copy of such papers. Therefore, the Office has made a copy of these papers, substituted them for the originals in the file, and stamped that copy:

COPY OF PAPERS

ORIGINALLY FILED

---

If applicant wants to review the accuracy of the Office's copy of such papers, applicant may either inspect the application (37 CFR 1.14(d)) or may request a copy of the Office's records of such papers (*i.e.*, a copy of the copy made by the Office) from the Office of Public Records for the fee specified in 37 CFR 1.19(b)(4). Please do **not** call the Technology Center's Customer Service Center to inquiry about the completeness or accuracy of Office's copy of the above-identified papers, as the Technology Center's Customer Service Center will **not** be able to provide this service.

If applicant does not consider the Office's copy of such papers to be accurate, applicant

Art Unit: 1631

must provide a copy of the above-identified papers (except for any U.S. or foreign patent documents submitted with the above-identified papers) with a statement that such copy is a complete and accurate copy of the originally submitted documents. If applicant provides such a copy of the above-identified papers and statement within **THREE MONTHS** of the mail date of this Office action, the Office will add the original mailroom date and use the copy provided by applicant as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers in place of the copy made by the Office. Otherwise, the Office's copy will be used as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers (*i.e.*, the Office will use the copy of the above-identified papers made by the Office for examination and all other purposes). This three-month period is not extendable.

2. It is brought to the applicant's attention that in the marked up copy of the claims of the amendment filed 22 January 2002 claim 83 is listed as cancelled, however claim 83 is pending.

***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 59, 60, and 88 are objected to because of the following informalities: It appears that the applicants intended for claim 59 to depend from claim 31 rather than the stated claim 1, and for claim 60 to depend from claim 59 rather than the stated claim 29. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 88 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 88 depends from itself. It appears that the applicants intended claim 88 to depend from claim 87.

***Terminal Disclaimer***

5. The terminal disclaimer filed on 17 June 2003 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Application Number 09/706243 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

6. The applicants are requested to refrain from filing Information Disclosure Statements that duplicate references previously of record in prior Information Disclosure Statements. Duplication of citations places an unnecessary burden on the Office to determine which citations are duplications during the publication process should the application issue as a patent.
7. References HS1 in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 22 January 2002 and reference C-158 in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 16 June 2003 have not been considered because the citations are not publications available to the public.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
9. Claims 4-8, 34-38, and 64-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. Claim s 4-8, 34-38, and 64-68 recite the limitation "the first and second zinc finger proteins" or "the first zinc finger protein." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Double Patenting***

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would be obvious over, the reference claim(s). see, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46

USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.

Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

12. Claims 1-20, 22-50, 52-78, and 80-88 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-85 of U.S. Patent No. 6,534,261. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent No. 6,534,261 claims species of the instant generic claims.

13. Claims 31-50, 52-78, and 80-88 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,882. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent No. 6,607,882 claims species of the instant generic claims.

14. Claims 1, 9, 31, 39, 61, and 69 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 89-109 of copending Application No. 10/222614. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to modify the claimed method of Application No. 10/222614 by use of zinc finger proteins with a  $K_d$  of less than about 25 nM because the specification of Application 10/222614 states on page 6 that such embodiments are within the claimed genus.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1631

15. Claims 1, 10-12, 15, 31, 40-42, 45, 61, 70-72, and 74 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of copending Application No. 10/245415. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to modify the claimed method of Application No. 10/245415 by use of zinc finger proteins with a  $K_d$  of less than about 25 nM because the specification of Application 10/245415 states on page 9 that such embodiments are within the claimed genus and because the claims of Application 10/245415 are otherwise species of the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

16. Claims 1-8, 10-12, 18-20, 22, 23, 26-29, 31-38, 40-42, 48-50, 52, 53, 56-59, 61-68, 70-72, 76-78, 80, 81, and 84-87 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8-11, and 25-34 of copending Application No. 09/942087. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to modify the claimed method of Application No. 09/942087 by use of zinc finger proteins with a  $K_d$  of less than about 25 nM because the specification of Application 09/942087 states on page 11 that such embodiments are within the claimed genus.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.


***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Brusca whose telephone number is 703 308-4231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on 703 308-4025. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0196.



John S. Brusca  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1631

jsb